

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 10 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking enablement. Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. The Examiner had made numerous objections to the form of the claims.

By this Amendment, Applicants cancelled claims 2 and 3, and amended claims 1, 6-7, and 10. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

1. Enablement Rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 1 and dependent claims for allegedly lacking enablement for a portion of the claimed genus. While the Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's contention, claim 1 had been amended to remove the portions of the claimed structural genus which gave rise to the rejection. The rejection had been obviated.

2. Indefiniteness Rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 1 and dependent claims for alleged indefiniteness based on lack of antecedent basis and other informalities with respect to portions of the claimed structural genus. While the Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's contention, claim 1 had been amended to remove the portions of the claimed structural genus which gave rise to the rejection. The rejection had been obviated.

3. Claim Objections

The Examiner made several objections to the claims. The amendments obviate the objection.

It is believed all claims are now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully solicited.
The Examiner is authorized to deduct additional fees believed due from our Deposit Account No.
50-4771.

Respectfully submitted,

KAPLAN GILMAN & PERGAMENT LLP
1480 Route 9 North, Suite 204
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
Telephone (732) 636-4500

Dated: February 2, 2009

/Edward D. Pergament/
Edward D. Pergament
(Reg. No. 43,346)